



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/241,508	02/01/1999	JAMES R. EVANS	PIL0031/US	8819

7590 08/23/2002

MARK W. BINDER
KAGAN BINDER, PLLC
221 MAIN STREET NO.
SUITE 200
STILLWATER, MN 55082-5021

EXAMINER

BECKER, DREW E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2002

22

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/241,508

Applicant(s)

EVANS ET AL.

Examiner

Drew E Becker

Art Unit

1761

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY (check either a) or b))

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. **ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 06 August 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: the new issue is that the "shaping surface draws the first skin downwardly".

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 61-66 and 68-77.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Carollo does not teach a movable cutter. However, attention is drawn to Figure 4, #16 of Carollo which illustrates a cutter which operates in the same manner as applicants'; the dough is pinched and cut between two dull surfaces wherein one is movable (#16). Applicant argues that Mackowecki does not teach pinching and cutting. However, Mackowecki clearly illustrates this action in Figure 5. Applicant also argues that Mackowecki and Carollo do not teach cutting a "single" dough sheet. However, the claims do not include this limitation. Regardless, a "single" dough sheet quite often can have multiple layers, for instance the layered dough sheet used to make croissants, with butter or lard between the layers. In addition, Mackowecki teaches a dough sheet which is pinched and cut (Figure 5, 26), as does Carollo (Figure 6, 14). Applicant argues that Mackowecki does not teach different geometries at its perimeter. However, Mackowecki clearly teaches an outer periphery (#39) with a different geometry from the rounded, inner periphery (#41) as viewed in the radial illustration of Figure 5. The previously cited rejections of the Final Rejection, paper no. 17, are still relied upon for the previously cited reasons. .

David Beck
8-19-02

Keith Hendricks
KEITH HENDRICKS
PRIMARY EXAMINER